

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/771,562	YOKOUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jerry T. Rahl	2874	

All Participants:

(1) Jerry T. Rahl.

(2) David E. Heisey.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 August 2006

Time: 2:00 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

3, 7-9, 11, 14, 18-20 and 22.

Prior art documents discussed:

US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0235362 to Sugama et al.



Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)	 John D. Lee Primary Examiner	_____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)
--	---	--

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner noted that Applicant's Amendment received June 20, 2006 failed to put the claims in condition for allowance in view of the Sugama reference because each of the signal electrodes (130a, 130b) make a pair with the ground electrode (131). Therefore, the Sugama reference describes "two pairs of electrodes" as recited in the amended claims. It was agreed that new claim language describing "first and second pairs of electrodes" would put the claims in condition for allowance because the three electrodes of the Sugama reference cannot be construed to include first and second pairs of electrodes. The Applicant agreed to and Examiner's Amendment to reflect such new language in the claims.